



ATLANTA CINCINNATI COLUMBUS LOS ANGELES WASHINGTON, D.C.  
CHICAGO CLEVELAND DAYTON NEW YORK

August 6, 2025

Via ECF

Hon. Gregory H. Woods  
United States District Judge  
Southern District of New York  
Daniel Patrick Moynihan United States Courthouse  
500 Pearl Street, Room 2260  
New York, NY 10007

Re: *City of New York v. EnviroMD Group LLC et al*, 1:24-cv-05161-GHW-JW

Dear Hon. Judge Woods:

We represent Defendants Vape More and Vape Plus (“Defendants”) in the above-captioned matter. In accordance with Your Honor’s Individual Rules of Practice in Civil Cases, Rule F, we write jointly with the Plaintiff, The City of New York (“Plaintiff” and collectively with Defendants “Parties”), regarding the joint stipulation that was filed today.

First, the Parties request that the Court enter the stipulation extending the time for Defendants to respond to the Second Amended Complaint because the Parties have reached a settlement in principle for Defendant Vape More and require additional time to finalize the settlement agreement, which should negate any need for Vape More to file an answer to the Second Amended Complaint. Due to multiple conflicting deadlines and court appearances, counsel for Defendants also requires additional time to prepare Vape Plus’s answer to the Second Amended Complaint. Pursuant to the Court’s Order dated July 21, 2025 (Dkt. 106), the Parties submitted a joint status report on July 25, 2025, and a proposed case management schedule to extend all dates and deadlines by 90 days to facilitate settlement discussions and substantially complete fact and

Krupa.Patel@ThompsonHine.com Fax: 202.331.8330 Phone: 202.973.2759

THOMPSON HINE LLP  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

1919 M Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20036-3537

www.ThompsonHine.com  
O: 202.331.8800  
F: 202.331.8330



Via ECF  
August 6, 2025  
Page 2

expert discovery. (Dkt. 107). The parties also agreed to a two-week extension to serve answers to the Second Amended Complaint. (Dkt. 61). However, due to an inadvertent oversight, the proposed case management schedule did not include the proposed two-week extension. Second, both the Defendants and the Plaintiff agree that the extension of time is necessary to reduce unnecessary filings if the Vape More settlement is completed. Third, the Court has legal authority to enter the stipulation because the Court's own rules of practice allow for such an extension under Your Honor's Individual Rules of Practice in Civil Cases, Rule F. Fourth, the parties have agreed that this will be the final extension granted and the Defendants will promptly serve their responsive pleading on or before Wednesday, August 20, 2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Via ECF  
August 6, 2025  
Page 3

**MURIEL GOODE-TRUFANT**

Acting Corporation Counsel of the  
City of New York  
100 Church Street, Room 20-99  
New York, NY 10007  
(212) 356-2032

By: /s/ Aatif Iqbal  
Aatif Iqbal  
Eric Proshansky  
Elizabeth Slater  
Alexandra Jung

Assistant Corporation Counsels  
*Counsel for Plaintiff the City of New York*

**THOMPSON HINE LLP**

By: /s/ Krupa A. Patel  
Krupa A. Patel  
Eric N. Heyer (pending *pro hac vice*)  
Joseph A. Smith (pending *pro hac vice*)  
Ryan Callinan  
1919 M Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
Phone: 202.331.8800  
Fax: 202.331.8330  
[Krupa.Patel@ThompsonHine.com](mailto:Krupa.Patel@ThompsonHine.com)  
[Ryan.Callinan@ThompsonHine.com](mailto:Ryan.Callinan@ThompsonHine.com)  
[Eric.Heyer@ThompsonHine.com](mailto:Eric.Heyer@ThompsonHine.com)  
[Joe.Smith@ThompsonHine.com](mailto:Joe.Smith@ThompsonHine.com)

*Counsel for Defendants Vape More Inc. and  
Vape Plus Distribution Corp.*